PTO/SB/21 (05-03)
Approved for use through 04/30/2003, OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number CRADE MARTIS 10/605,153 **TRANSMITTAL** Filing Date 9/11/2003 **FORM** First Named Inventor Fletcher, et al. Art Unit (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) 3634 **Examiner Name** Jerry E. Redman Attorney Docket Number

Total Number of Pages in This Submission							- Tullioci	2148	88/041	102	····	
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)												
	Fee Transmittal Form Fee Attached Amendment/Reply After Final Affidavits/declaration(s) Extension of Time Request Express Abandonment Request Information Disclosure Statement Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53			Drawing(s) Licensing-related Papers Petition Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address					After Allowance communication to Group Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Proprietary Information Status Letter Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below):			
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT												
Firm or Warren M. Haines			II (Reg. No. 40,632)						Customer Number 24024			
Signature Winder Charit												
Date February 24, 2005												
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING												
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.												
Typed or printed name Joyce Ford												
Signati	Signature Jou				R	ord	·			Date	2-3	4-05

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING



I hereby certify that this document is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this sufficient postage, 2005.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

)
) Examiner: Redman, Jerry E
) Group: 3634
)
))
)
)

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated January 27, 2005, Applicants elect to pursue in this application claims 1-12, identified as Invention II, with traverse.

The Office Action asserts that Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice and that the asserted Inventions are distinct. However, "[t]here are **two** criteria for a proper requirement for a restriction between patentably distinct inventions (A) The inventions must be independent; **and** (B) There must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is required." MPEP § 803, citations omitted, emphasis added. Thus there are *two* requirements for restriction: independence or distinctness *and* a serious burden. Both are required. Section 803 explicitly states that "[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made

without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions." Applicants respectfully submit that restriction is not proper in this case because search and examination can be made of the entire application without serious burden. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of and withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: $\frac{\partial}{\partial 1} \frac{\partial}{\partial 5}$

Warren M. Haines II (Reg. No. 40,632)

Customer No. 24024